



Original Research Article

DOI: 10.26479/2022.0803.03

## STUDY OF MORPHO-PHYSIOLOGICAL TRAITS AFFECTING GRAIN YIELD OF BARLEY GENOTYPES AT NORMAL AND SALINITY STRESS CONDITIONS

Mahdiyeh Zare-Kohan<sup>1\*</sup>, Nadali Babaeian Jelodar<sup>1</sup>, Seyed Ali Tabatabaee<sup>2</sup>,  
Mohammadreza Ghasemi-Nezhadraei<sup>3</sup>

1. Department of Plant Breeding and Biotechnology, Sari Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources University (SANRU), sari, Iran.
2. Seed and Plant Improvement Research Department, Yazd Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, AREEO, Yazd, Iran.
3. Department of Water Engineering, Islamic Azad University, Kerman Branch, Iran.

**ABSTRACT:** Salinity stress is one of the most important abiotic stresses, especially in arid and semi-arid regions. The current research was performed to identify traits associated with barley yield under normal and salinity stress conditions. In this research, 150 barley cultivars were planted in an alpha lattice design with five incomplete blocks in two replications under non-stress and salinity stress ( $EC=12\text{ dsm}^{-1}$ ) conditions at Agriculture and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, Yazd, Iran. Correlation analysis showed that the biological yield and harvest index had the highest significant positive correlation with grain yield in experimental environments. The result of stepwise regression indicated that biological yield, harvest index, relative water content, leaf chlorophyll content, thousand-grain weight, and flag leaf length were the most important influential traits under normal conditions that explained 97.93% of the total variance of grain yield. While biological yield, harvest index, days to tillering, grain filling period, and days from stemming to heading entered in the model under salinity stress, which explained 97.46% of the total variance. According to the path analysis results, the biological yield and harvest index had the most direct and positive effect on grain yield in non-stress and salinity stress conditions. The factor analysis determined seven factors for non-stress and eight factors for salinity stress conditions that explained 75.2 and 80.5% of the data's total variance. Overall, this study showed that biological yield and harvest index were the main traits related to grain yield that can be used in barley breeding programs in selecting high-yielding cultivars and lines.

**Keywords:** Barley, Correlation, Factor analysis, Path coefficient analysis, Stepwise regression analysis.

---

**Article History: Received: May 30, 2022; Revised: June 08, 2022; Accepted: June 21, 2022.**

---

**Corresponding Author: Dr. Mahdiyeh Zare-Kohan\*** Ph.D.

Department of Plant Breeding and Biotechnology, Sari Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources University (SANRU), sari, Iran. Email Address: mahdiyehzare65@gmail.com

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) is one of the oldest and most important crops in the Fertile Crescent that were domesticated about ten thousand years ago [19]. This plant belongs to the family of cereals. Barley has a more large-scale climatic adaptation compared to other grains [23]. Barley yields higher than wheat under salinity stress and adverse conditions, so barley is always used to rehabilitate barren and saline lands. Salinity stress is one of the most important abiotic stresses, especially in arid and semi-arid regions, which has always reduced crop production. Because most crops are sensitive to salt, so salinity is a severe risk for farmers today [11]. Improvement of quantitative traits such as tolerance to salinity is the main goal in agriculture and plant breeding. Determining the relationships between traits and discovering hidden factors, and studying genetic diversity under salinity stress to determine the affecting traits grain yield can be an efficient step in barley breeding programs to solve this problem. In-plant breeding programs, the selection is based on many agronomic traits that may influence positively or negatively correlated. Therefore, statistical methods that reduce useful traits on grain yield without removing useful information are valuable to researchers [12]. In one study, Ataei [6] performed a correlation analysis between traits. The results showed that the barley grain yield had a positive and significant correlation with harvest index and biological yield. Furthermore, there was no significant correlation between grain yield and weight. Hosseinpour [14], Seyed Aghamiri et al. [26], and Ahmadi et al. [5] also reported that the correlation between grain yield and biological yield was more than the correlation between grain yield and other traits. Abarnak et al. [1], in a study on barley agronomic and physiological characteristics, showed a positive and significant correlation between yield and harvest index traits, biological yield, fertile tiller, plant height, and straw yield. However, although there is a positive relationship between yield and some of its components, negative correlations between some of these components mean that selecting all of them cannot be useful in increasing grain yield [24]. Also, an increase in one performance component may decrease some other components [23, 9], so using multivariate methods is a good suggestion. Factor analysis is a powerful multivariate method used to reduce data, explain the contribution of traits to the total variance, identify hidden characteristics affecting performance, and group traits based on the internal relationships between them. In this method, variables that are strongly correlated with each other are placed in several independent

factors. Seyed Aghamiri et al. [26] used factor analysis in research on 28 barley genotypes. Their results showed that four factors explained 70.68% of the total changes. The first, second, and third factors were yield, morphological characteristics, and seed characteristics. Jabbari and Zolfaghary [15], in the study on barley, introduced eight factors and five factors under normal and stress conditions, respectively. They named the productivity factor and the origin of making photosynthetic materials for similar traits. Furthermore, Abarnak et al. [1] identified ten factors in an experiment on barley by factor analysis: the most critical factors were phenological, spike characteristics, and flag leaf. Moslemi et al. [20] investigated 72 double haploid lines with two of their parents. The factor analysis results showed that four factors had eigenvalues higher than one that explained 71% of the total variance, and the share of the first to fourth factors was 31, 21, 11, and 8% of changes, respectively. In an experiment on barley, Abdulla [2] introduced three factors using factor analysis, which explained 36.63, 20.47, and 13.40% of the total changes, respectively. Several methods are for analysing yield components; stepwise regression is used as a complement to other multivariate techniques. Another multivariate method is path coefficient analysis, which can be provided by creating causal models to properly analyse the correlation between variables. Path coefficient analysis is used to assess the importance of useful traits on grain yield. This method reveals the relationships between traits and their direct and indirect effects on grain yield. Hosein Babaei et al. [13] and Saroei et al. [25] reported a direct and positive effect of biological yield on grain yield in their research using the path coefficient analysis method. Also, in a study using this method, the harvest index's direct effect on grain yield was confirmed [28]. This study aimed to identify morphological and physiological traits affecting yield in barley genotypes using factor analysis, stepwise regression analysis, and path analysis under salinity and normal stress conditions. We hope it can provide researchers with helpful information on barley breeding.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This experiment used 148 common barley cultivars of northern and western Europe collected by the Wageningen University of Netherlands. Two control cultivars named Khatam (resistant to salinity) and Nosrat (non-resistant to salinity) from Iranian cultivars were used. The present study was performed in an alpha-lattice design with five incomplete blocks in two replications. Each block includes 30 plots in non-stress and salinity stress ( $EC=12 \text{ dsm}^{-1}$ ) environments at the Agriculture and Natural Resources Research Station of Yazd ( $31^{\circ} 55' \text{ N}$ ,  $54^{\circ} 16' \text{ E}$ , 1213 m of sea level), Iran. The plot size was  $0.45 \times 2$  meters in dimensions consisting of three 2-meter lines, 15 cm apart. The studied traits include phenological, morphological, and physiological traits as follows: Grain yield (GY), Days to tillering (DT), Days to stemming (DS), Days to heading (DH), Days from stemming to heading (DSH), Grain filling period (GFP), Days to physiological maturity (DPM), Plant height (PH), Thousand-grain weight (TGW), Biological yield (BY), Harvest index (HI), Flag leaf length (FLL), Flag leaf width (FLW), Flag leaf area (FLA), Number of fertile tillers (NFT), Number of

total tillers (NTT), Spike length (SL), Grain weight per spike (GWS), Number of grains per spike (NGS), Relative water content (RWC), Leaf chlorophyll content (LChC) and Leaf Proline content (LPC). Leaf chlorophyll content was measured from three flag leaf points at the heading stage in 10 samples of each plot with a manual chlorophyll meter (SPAD). Then the average of each replicate was used for statistical analysis. Leaf Proline content was measured from 15 flag leaves in each plot at the heading stage and immediately transferred to the laboratory. Proline was extracted by using the method of Bates et al. [7]. The relative water content calculated after the completion of the flag leaf from equation (1) [10]:

$$\text{RWC} = (\text{Fresh weight} - \text{Dry weight}) / (\text{Saturation weight} - \text{Dry weight}) \times 100 \quad (1)$$

The flag leaf area was calculated based on the proposed formula by Muller [21] as follows:

$$S = 0.75 \times L \times W \quad (2)$$

S: Flag leaf area, L: Flag leaf length, and W: Flag leaf width

Also, the harvest index is calculated as follows:

$$\text{HI} = (\text{Grain yield} / \text{Biological yield}) \times 100 \quad (3)$$

The data normality test was first performed based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method using SPSS software. Then combined analysis of variance was performed with SAS 9.1 software. A simple phenotypic correlation between traits under normal conditions and salinity stress was calculated. Also, salinity tolerance and studied traits were evaluated in stress and non-stress environments using multivariate, including factor analysis, stepwise regression analysis, and path coefficient analysis with SAS 9.1 and Path analysis software.

### **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **3.1. Analysis of variance**

The combined analysis of variance (not presented) showed significant genotype  $\times$  environment interaction for most of the traits except for flag leaf width and leaf chlorophyll content; Thus, analysis of variance was performed separately for each non-stress and salinity stress conditions. The results show a significant difference between genotypes for most studied traits except for the number of fertile tillers under non-stress conditions and relative water content and Leaf chlorophyll content under salinity stress. This difference indicates the diversity between genotypes for genetic analysis of these traits.

#### **3.2. Correlation analysis**

Examining the correlation between different traits makes it possible to act more accurately in removing ineffective traits. In this study, simple phenotypic correlation coefficients were calculated using the Pearson correlation coefficient to investigate the relationship between grain yield and other measured traits. Correlation analysis of traits for normal conditions and salinity stress is presented

in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Phenotypic correlation coefficients of the studied traits (above the diameter for non-stress conditions and below the diameter for salinity stress).

Traits	GY	DT	DS	DH	DSH	GFP	DPM	PH	TGW	BY	HI
GY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	1	-0.1	-0.03	-0.06	-0.02	0.35	0.27	0.1	0.1	0.79**	0.64**
DT (day)	-0.42	1	0.03	0.19	0.12	0.01	0.24	0.21	0.08	-0.06	-0.09
DS (day)	-0.14	0.21	1	0.51*	-0.71	-0.2	0.41	-0.16	-0.32	-0.1	0.06
DH (day)	-0.37	0.2	0.5*	1	0.25	-0.6	0.61**	-0.04	-0.41	-0.05	-0.05
DSH (day)	-0.31	0.07	-0.18	0.77**	1	-0.27	0.03	0.15	0.03	0.07	-0.11
GFP (day)	0.44*	-0.16	-0.23	-0.75	-0.68	1	0.27	0.19	0.23	0.29	0.19
DPM (day)	-0.13	0.15	0.52*	0.78**	0.5*	-0.16	1	0.14	-0.26	0.23	0.13
PH (cm)	0.2	-0.27	-0.28	0.16	0.39	-0.11	0.14	1	0.048	0.4	-0.36
TGW (g)	0.25	-0.17	-0.17	-0.12	-0.01	0.21	0.01	0.33	1	0.02	0.19
BY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	0.79**	0.51*	-0.19	-0.07	0.06	0.14	0.02	0.49*	0.19	1	0.06
HI (%)	0.7**	-0.06	-0.04	-0.52	-0.56	0.59**	-0.21	-0.22	0.23	0.14	1
FLL (cm)	0.18	-0.28	0.005	0.14	0.15	-0.04	0.16	0.37	0.22	0.4	-0.15
FLW (cm)	0.02	-0.12	0.06	0.32	0.32	-0.14	0.35	0.42*	0.22	0.29	-0.29
FLA (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.09	-0.19	0.03	0.27	0.29	-0.11	0.3	0.44*	0.25	0.36	-0.25
NFT	0.09	0.21	0.1	0.07	-0.01	0.02	0.12	-0.3	-0.11	0.01	0.18
NTT	0.05	0.22	0.14	0.11	0.03	-0.03	0.14	-0.32	-0.13	-0.03	0.15
SL(cm)	0.2	-0.16	0.05	-0.28	-0.36	0.28	-0.15	-0.09	0.18	0.05	0.28
GWS (g)	0.13	-0.17	-0.34	-0.21	0.01	0.14	-0.18	0.38	0.17	0.19	0.01
NGS	0.06	-0.12	-0.29	-0.19	-0.01	0.1	-0.19	0.27	-0.01	0.13	-0.05
RWC (%)	0.02	0.1	-0.05	-0.06	-0.02	0.14	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.09	-0.04
LChC	-0.01	0.15	0.16	0.23	0.14	-0.12	0.23	-0.08	0.07	-0.05	0.09
LPC (μmol/g)	-0.04	0.13	0.05	0.06	0.03	-0.02	0.07	-0.12	-0.14	-0.13	0.07

\* and \*\*: significant at 5% and 1% probability levels, respectively, **GY**: Grain yield, **DT**: Days to tillering, **DS**: Days to stemming, **DH**: Days to heading, **DSH**: Days from stemming to heading, **GFP**: Grain filling period, **DPM**: Days to physiological maturity, **PH**: Plant height, **TGW**: Thousand-grain weight, **BY**: Biological yield, **HI**: Harvest index, **FLL**: Flag leaf length, **FLW**: Flag leaf width, **FLA**: Flag leaf area, **NFT**: Number of fertile tillers, **NTT**: Number of total tillers, **SL**: Spike length, **GWS**: Grain weight per spike, **NGS**: Number of grains per spike, **RWC**: Relative water content, **LChC**: Leaf chlorophyll content, **LPC**: Leaf Proline content.

**Continuation of Table 1.** Phenotypic correlation coefficients of the studied traits (above the diameter for non-stress conditions and below the diameter for salinity stress).

Traits	FLL	FLW	FLA	NFT	NTT	SL	GWS	NGS	RWC	LChC	LPC
GY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	-0.05	-0.13	-0.08	0.05	-0.018	-0.07	0.03	-0.02	-0.042	-0.15	0.01
DT (day)	0.11	0.24	0.17	-0.09	-0.13	-0.02	0.196	0.18	0.14	0.097	-0.03
DS (day)	0.005	0.12	0.056	0.08	0.09	0.12	-0.05	0.04	-0.04	0.17	0.04
DH (day)	0.14	0.31	0.23	0.08	0.046	0.06	0.085	0.22	0.19	0.18	0.11
DSH (day)	0.11	0.121	0.124	-0.022	-0.064	-0.09	0.12	0.14	0.21	-0.046	0.048
GFP (day)	0.19	-0.014	0.07	0.18	0.19	-0.004	0.04	-0.07	-0.07	0.005	-0.15
DPM (day)	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.27	0.24	0.06	0.14	0.2	0.17	0.22	-0.012
PH (cm)	0.44*	0.48*	0.47*	-0.13	-0.12	-0.23	0.55**	0.53*	-0.27	0.02	-0.06
TGW (g)	-0.03	-0.13	-0.05	-0.14	-0.16	-0.004	0.18	-0.07	0.003	-0.28	-0.06
BY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	0.07	0.09	0.08	-0.05	-0.1	-0.19	0.27	0.21	-0.14	-0.06	0.004
HI (%)	-0.22	-0.36	-0.27	0.14	0.08	0.1	-0.28	-0.32	0.16	-0.22	0.02
FLL (cm)	1	0.75**	0.88**	0.11	0.15	0.03	0.34	0.34	-0.07	0.25	-0.1
FLW (cm)	0.76**	1	0.94**	-0.02	0.0007	-0.18	0.54**	0.58**	-0.17	0.2	-0.03
FLA (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.89**	0.96**	1	0.02	0.051	-0.14	0.52**	0.53**	-0.11	0.2	-0.06
NFT	0.07	-0.04	-0.02	1	0.97**	0.27	-0.35	-0.34	0.09	0.13	-0.02
NTT	0.05	-0.04	-0.03	0.98**	1	0.29	-0.33	-0.31	0.05	0.15	-0.01
SL (cm)	0.08	-0.1	-0.05	-0.06	-0.06	1	-0.36	-0.39	0.12	0.15	0.04
GWS (g)	0.33	0.32	0.4	-0.095	-0.11	-0.12	1	0.93**	-0.23	-0.05	-0.02
NGS	0.25	0.24	0.29	-0.09	-0.1	-0.17	0.93**	1	-0.22	0.03	0.01
RWC (%)	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.036	0.07	-0.05	-0.065	1	0.06	-0.06
LChC	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.09	-0.09	-0.09	-0.046	1	0.06
LPC (μmol/g)	-0.22	-0.2	-0.2	0.02	0.02	-0.01	-0.14	-0.1	0.05	-0.04	1

The results showed that biological yield ( $r = 0.79^{**}$ ) and harvest index ( $r = 0.64^{**}$ ) under normal conditions and grain filling period ( $r = 0.44^*$ ), biological yield ( $r = 0.79^{**}$ ) and harvest index ( $r = 0.7^{**}$ ) under salinity stress had the highest positive and significant correlation with grain yield. Therefore, phenotypic correlation coefficients of traits in both experimental environments showed a positive and significant correlation between grain yield with biological yield and harvest index. Ataei [6], Ahmadi and Hosseinpour [4], and Abarnak et al. [1] also showed that barley grain yield had a positive and significant correlation with harvest index and biological yield. Hosseinpour [14] and Ahmadi et al. [5] also reported that the correlation between grain yield and biological yield was more than the correlation between grain yield and other traits.

### 3.3. Stepwise regression analysis

A linear multivariate stepwise regression method was used to determine the contribution of the cumulative effect of traits in determining grain yield. This method investigated grain yield as a dependent variable with other traits as independent variables under normal conditions. Results of stepwise regression under non-stress conditions are shown in Table 2. Biological yield ( $R^2=62.21\%$ ), harvest index ( $R^2=35.41\%$ ), relative water content ( $R^2=0.11\%$ ), Leaf chlorophyll content ( $R^2=0.1\%$ ), thousand-grain weight ( $R^2=0.05\%$ ) and flag leaf length ( $R^2=0.05\%$ ) entered to the model as effective traits that highly contributed to grain yield variations. These traits explained 97.93% of total variations of grain yield. The model of stepwise regression was as below:

$$Y=0.008+0.31X_1+0.033X_2-0.001X_3+0.002X_4$$

In this model, Y,  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ ,  $X_3$  and  $X_4$  denote grain yield, biological yield, harvest index, relative water content and leaf chlorophyll content, respectively. The significant coefficient in the regression equation indicates these traits are to be effective in increasing yield (table 2). The above equation showed that biological yield, harvest index, leaf chlorophyll content and flag leaf length had a positive impact and relative water content and thousand-grain weight had a negative effect on increasing grain yield. Dadashi et al. [8] used stepwise regression to introduce three traits: number of seeds per spike, number of fertile tillers and 1000-seed weight as traits affecting grain yield. Ahmadi et al. [5] studied barley by stepwise regression analysis. They identified biological yield, spike weight, flag leaf length, flag leaf area, and spike length as traits affecting grain yield. Also, Nasri et al. [22], with the stepwise regression analysis method, introduced the traits of spike weight, total dry weight and harvest index as important traits of barley grain yield.

Results of stepwise regression under salinity stress conditions are shown in Table 3. Biological yield ( $R^2=62.07\%$ ), harvest index ( $R^2=35.17\%$ ), days to tillering ( $R^2=0.1\%$ ), grain filling period ( $R^2=0.07\%$ ), and days from stemming to heading ( $R^2=0.05\%$ ) entered to the model as effective traits that highly contributed to grain yield variations. These traits explained 97.46% of total variations of grain yield. The model of stepwise regression was as below:

$$Y=-0.05+0.27X_1+0.03X_2-0.005X_3+0.002X_4$$

In this model, Y,  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ ,  $X_3$  and  $X_4$  denote grain yield, biological yield, harvest index, days to tillering and grain filling period, respectively. According to the results of Table 3, all entered traits into the model except day from stemming to heading had a significant effect on grain yield, which indicates that these traits are effective in grain yield. The above equation showed that the biological yield and harvest index had a positive impact, and days to tillering, grain filling period, and days from stemming to heading had a negative effect on increasing grain yield. Afzalifar et al. [3], with respect to stepwise regression analysis, introduced the total number of grains, biomass and plant height as traits affecting grain yield.

**Table 2.** Stepwise regression analysis for grain yield (dependent variable) and other traits (independent variable) under non-stress conditions.

Step	Variable entered	Parameter estimate	Partial R <sup>2</sup>	Model R <sup>2</sup>	F Value
1	Biological yield (x <sub>1</sub> )	0.31	62.21	62.21	243.6**
2	Harvest index (x <sub>2</sub> )	0.033	35.41	97.62	2179.7**
3	Relative water content (x <sub>3</sub> )	-0.001	0.11	97.73	6.95**
4	Leaf chlorophyll content (x <sub>4</sub> )	0.002	0.1	97.83	6.59**
5	Thousand-grain weight (x <sub>5</sub> )	-0.002	0.05	97.88	3.3 <sup>n.s</sup>
6	Flag leaf length (x <sub>6</sub> )	0.003	0.05	97.93	3.41 <sup>n.s</sup>

n.s, \* and \*\*: Not-significant and significant at 5% and 1% probability levels, respectively.

**Table 3.** Stepwise regression analysis for grain yield (dependent variable) and other traits (independent variable) under salinity stress conditions.

Step	Variable entered	Parameter estimate	Partial R <sup>2</sup>	Model R <sup>2</sup>	F Value
1	Biological yield (x <sub>1</sub> )	0.27	62.07	62.07	242.2**
2	Harvest index (x <sub>2</sub> )	0.03	35.17	97.24	1870.9**
3	Days to tillering (x <sub>3</sub> )	-0.005	0.1	97.34	5.61*
4	Grain filling period (x <sub>4</sub> )	-0.002	0.07	97.39	3.91*
5	Days from stemming to heading (x <sub>5</sub> )	-0.001	0.05	97.46	2.88 <sup>n.s</sup>

n.s, \* and \*\*: Not-significant and significant at 5% and 1% probability levels, respectively.

### 3.4. Path analysis

Path analysis was done based on correlation coefficients to determine important traits' direct and indirect effects on grain yield. According to the path analysis results, the biological yield had the most direct effect under both non-stress (0.75) and salinity stress (0.7) conditions (Tables 4 and 5); also, It had a strong correlation with yield ( $r=0.79^{**}$ ) which indicates its remarkable effect on grain yield and therefore it can be used for selection with the aim of increasing grain yield. Seyed Aghamiri et al. [26], Ahmadi et al. [5], and Saroei et al. [25] also reported a direct and positive effect of biological yield on grain yield. After biological yield, the harvest index showed the most direct effect on improving grain yield, and its total effect under normal conditions and salinity stress were  $r = 0.64^{**}$  and  $r = 0.7^{**}$ , respectively (Tables 4 and 5). Zaefizadeh et al. [28] also reported the direct effect of harvest index on grain yield. Harvest index had the most indirect effect by improving thousand-grain weight on grain yield in non-stress and salinity stress conditions (Tables 4 and 5). The indirect effect of the harvest index was negligible through other traits, which could increase



grain yield by assuming other variables are constant.

Given that the correlation coefficient between the two traits was approximately equal to the causal coefficient between the two traits in normal and saline conditions, the correlation coefficient expressed the extent of the actual relationship between the two variables. Thus selection through this trait can be useful. The biological yield indirectly increased grain yield by increasing thousand-grain weight under salinity stress.

**Table 4.** Path coefficients analysis of direct and indirect effects of the traits with grain yield under non-stress conditions.

Traits	Direct effect	Indirect effect via			Correlation with yield
		Biological yield	Harvest index	Thousand-grain weight	
Biological yield (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	0.75	-	0.05	0.01	0.79**
Harvest index (%)	0.6	0.04	-	0.11	0.64**
Thousand-grain weight (g)	0.005	0.0001	0.001	-	0.1 <sup>n.s</sup>
Residual Error	0.13				

n.s, \* and \*\*: Not-significant and significant at 5% and 1% probability levels, respectively.

**Table 5.** Path coefficients analysis of direct and indirect effects of the traits with grain yield under salinity stress conditions.

Traits	Direct effect	Indirect effect via			Correlation with yield
		Biological yield	Harvest index	Thousand-grain weight	
Biological yield (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	0.7	-	0.1	0.13	0.79**
Harvest index (%)	0.61	0.09	-	0.14	0.7**
Thousand-grain weight (g)	0.003	0.0006	0.0007	-	0.25 <sup>n.s</sup>
Residual Error	0.15				

n.s, \* and \*\*: Not-significant and significant at 5% and 1% probability levels, respectively.

### 3.5. Factor analysis

The purpose of factor analysis is to reduce data. In this method, variables that are strongly correlated with each other are placed in several independent factors. In general, factor analysis is used to reduce data, describe the total diversity of a community, explain the contribution of traits to total diversity, group traits based on the interrelationships between them and study genetic diversity. The sign of factor coefficients within each factor indicates the relationship between these traits. The largest coefficient in any factor or set of significant traits that are morphologically distinct and important is used to name the factors. The variance of each factor in percentage indicates its importance in interpreting the data's overall changes. The commonality rate of the trait indicates a part of the

variance of a trait related to common factors. According to factor analysis results by the Varimax method under non-stress conditions (Table 6), the first seven factors had eigenvalues greater than one, which explained 75.2% of the data's total changes.

**Table 6.** Results of factor analysis of the studied traits by the varimax method under non-stress conditions.

Traits	Rotated Factors							Communality value
	FA1	FA2	FA3	FA4	FA5	FA6	FA7	
GY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	-0.088	0.026	0.93	-0.06	0.03	0.02	-0.24	0.93
DT (day)	0.22	-0.23	-0.05	-0.12	-0.003	0.63	0.18	0.54
DS (day)	0.06	0.05	-0.02	0.33	0.92	0.08	0.04	0.97
DH (day)	0.26	0.06	-0.003	0.82	0.18	0.41	-0.03	0.95
DSH (day)	0.15	-0.01	0.02	0.29	-0.88	0.24	-0.07	0.95
GFP (day)	0.09	0.2	0.45	-0.74	0.09	-0.01	0.14	0.83
DPM (day)	0.39	0.27	0.44	0.25	0.3	0.48	0.1	0.82
PH (cm)	0.62	-0.23	0.27	-0.15	-0.2	-0.16	0.25	0.66
TGW (g)	-0.007	-0.16	-0.04	-0.6	-0.18	0.09	-0.45	0.63
BY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	0.14	-0.14	0.87	-0.004	-0.12	-0.15	0.09	0.84
HI (%)	-0.35	0.2	0.44	-0.086	0.18	0.23	-0.57	0.76
FLL (cm)	0.82	0.24	-0.026	-0.14	-0.01	0.1	0.11	0.77
FLW (cm)	0.92	0.003	-0.07	0.09	0.04	0.05	0.09	0.87
FLA (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.93	0.09	-0.05	-0.02	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.89
NFT	0.027	0.92	0.07	0.03	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.86
NTT	0.06	0.93	0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.09	0.04	0.88
SL (cm)	-0.23	0.43	-0.15	-0.07	0.12	0.23	0.14	0.35
GWS (g)	0.71	-0.51	0.13	-0.02	-0.04	-0.09	-0.08	0.79
NGS (g)	0.72	-0.49	0.1	0.17	-0.002	-0.1	0.01	0.8
RWC (%)	-0.22	0.12	-0.06	0.06	-0.17	0.7	-0.05	0.6
LChC	0.1	0.16	-0.04	0.08	0.11	0.2	0.76	0.67
LPC (μmol/g)	-0.11	-0.02	0.08	0.36	-0.07	-0.17	0.1	0.2
Eigen Value	4.7	3.12	2.6	2.03	1.73	1.32	1.03	-
Relative variance (%)	21.4	14.2	11.8	9.2	7.9	6	4.7	-
Cumulative variance (%)	21.4	35.6	47.4	56.6	64.4	70.5	75.2	-

**FA:** Factor analysis, See Table 1 for the abbreviation of the traits used here.

The first factor, which had the highest variance, explained 21.4% of the total changes. This factor is mainly defined by plant height (0.62), flag leaf length (0.82), flag leaf width (0.92), flag leaf area

(0.93), grain weight per spike (0.71) and the number of grains per spike (0.72). Therefore, this factor can be called “efficiency and source of making photosynthetic materials”. This factor shows that phenological traits cause the storage of available materials for the plant’s reproductive growth by affecting the vegetative growth traits related to the plant’s fixed capital. Jabbari and Zolfaghary [15], in a study on barley, introduced six and five factors under stress and in non-stress conditions, respectively. They named the efficiency and source of making photosynthetic materials for similar traits. The second factor (Table 6) that accounted for 14.2% of the total variance is related to the traits of number of fertile tillers (0.92) and number of total tillers (0.93), which have a positive and high factor load, and as the factor of performance and performance components is called. The third factor that explained 11.8% of the total variance was related to grain yield (0.93) and biological yield (0.87), which can be defined as the grain yield factor. In a study on barley, Khajavi et al. [17] identified three factors using factor analysis. They introduced one factor as an effective factor in increasing grain yield that had a positive correlation with the number of grains per spike, grain yield, Thousand-grain weight and harvest index. The fourth factor (Table 6) is loaded by days to heading (0.82) and grain filling period (-0.74), and it accounted for just 9.2% of the total variance. The fifth factor was related to days to stemming (0.92) and days from stemming to heading (-0.88); therefore, the fourth and fifth factors can be defined as phenological factors. Abarnak et al. [1], in research on barley, identified ten factors by factor analysis method, the most important of which were phenological factors, spike characteristics and flag leaf. Days to tillering (0.63) and relative water content (0.7) were related to the sixth factor, which explained 6% of the total variance. Finally, the seventh factor with the lowest percentage of variance (4.7) was related to harvest index (-0.57), and leaf chlorophyll (0.76) was called yield and related traits. The communality value is part of the variance of a variable that is related to common factors. The higher the communality value is, the more accurate it is in estimating the variance of the relevant variable [16]. The commonality of most traits (except days to tillering, spike length and leaf proline) was high (Table 6) in non-stress conditions, indicating that the number of selected factors was appropriate. These factors were able to justify the changes in traits well.

Based on factor analysis under salinity stress conditions (Table 7), the eight factors had eigenvalues greater than one, which explained 80.5% of the data’s total changes. The first factor explained 20.1% of the total changes. This factor is mainly defined by days to heading (0.78), days from stemming to heading (0.93) and grain filling period (-0.79) and harvest index (-0.68); Therefore, this factor was named as a phenological factor. The second factor that accounted for 18.9% of the total variance is related to the traits of flag leaf length (0.88), flag leaf width (0.86) and flag leaf area (0.91); Therefore, this factor can be called “flag leaf”. The third factor that explained 11.1% of the total variance was related to grain yield (0.85), biological yield (0.89) and day to tillering (-0.64), which can be defined as grain yield factor. The fourth factor (Table 7) is loaded by number of fertile tillers

(0.98) and number of total tillers (0.98), and it accounted for just 8.7 % of the total variance. The fifth factor was related to grain weight per spike (0.89) and number of grains per spike (0.91), and it explained 6.7% of the total variance; therefore, the fourth and fifth factors can be named as “Performance and performance components”. Days to stemming (0.8) and days to physiological maturity (0.69) were related to the sixth factor, which explained 5.2% of the total variance, and it was called the “phenological” factor.

**Table 7.** Results of factor analysis of the studied traits by the varimax method under salinity stress conditions.

Traits	Rotated Factors								Communality value
	FA1	FA2	FA3	FA4	FA5	FA6	FA7	FA8	
GY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	-0.41	-0.015	0.85	0.12	0.06	0.028	0.16	-0.002	0.94
DT (day)	0.1	-0.22	-0.64	0.25	0.06	0.2	0.21	0.23	0.67
DS (day)	-0.07	0.13	-0.22	0.05	-0.31	0.8	-0.06	-0.18	0.84
DH (day)	0.78	0.18	-0.1	0.048	-0.17	0.51	0.11	-0.05	0.96
DSH (day)	0.93	0.11	0.05	0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.17	0.08	0.92
GFP (day)	-0.79	-0.06	0.19	0.017	0.14	-0.06	0.07	0.23	0.75
DPM (day)	0.41	0.22	0.03	0.087	-0.12	0.69	0.23	0.15	0.8
PH (cm)	0.38	0.31	0.47	-0.34	0.25	-0.16	0.15	0.2	0.73
TGW (g)	-0.13	0.24	0.21	-0.15	-0.03	0.26	0.6	0.22	0.63
BY (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	0.01	0.25	0.89	0.02	0.05	-0.04	-0.03	0.08	0.86
HI (%)	-0.68	-0.3	0.35	0.21	0.057	0.076	0.35	-0.05	0.85
FLL (cm)	0.02	0.88	0.21	0.06	0.13	0.03	0.05	-0.02	0.84
FLW (cm)	0.2	0.86	0.098	-0.04	0.19	0.15	0.08	0.06	0.86
FLA (cm <sup>2</sup> )	0.15	0.91	0.15	-0.02	0.21	0.12	0.08	0.04	0.94
NFT	-0.01	0.02	0.002	0.98	-0.04	0.03	-0.002	0.0005	0.97
NTT	0.02	0.016	-0.036	0.98	-0.05	0.05	-0.007	-0.02	0.97
SL (cm)	-0.52	0.15	0.028	-0.13	-0.37	-0.08	0.18	0.006	0.49
GWS (g)	-0.07	0.27	0.08	-0.076	0.89	-0.18	0.03	-0.02	0.92
NGS (g)	-0.05	0.2	0.008	-0.065	0.91	-0.12	-0.09	-0.08	0.91
RWC (%)	-0.08	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-0.09	0.001	-0.06	0.88	0.79
LChC	0.06	0.06	-0.13	0.06	-0.07	0.2	0.73	-0.21	0.65
LPC (μmol/g)	0.05	-0.45	0.05	-0.02	0.12	0.42	-0.08	0.24	0.45
Eigen Value	4.42	4.16	2.45	1.91	1.47	1.14	1.1	1.06	-
Relative variance (%)	20.1	18.9	11.1	8.7	6.7	5.2	5	4.8	-
Cumulative variance (%)	20.1	39	50.1	58.8	65.5	70.7	75.7	80.5	-

FA: Factor analysis, See Table 1 for the abbreviation of the traits used here.

© 2022 Life Science Informatics Publication All rights reserved

Peer review under responsibility of Life Science Informatics Publications

2022 May - June RJLBPCS 8(3) Page No.40

Thousand-grain weight (0.6) and leaf chlorophyll (0.73) were related to the seventh factor, and relative water content (0.88) was related to the eighth factor, which had the lowest percentage of variance (5 and 4.8%, respectively) and was named as “performance and related traits” factors. The commonality was high (Table 7) in stress conditions, indicating that the number of selected factors was appropriate. These factors were able to justify the changes in traits well.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

The correlation analysis results, factor analysis, stepwise regression and path analysis in both non-stress and salinity stress conditions showed that biological yield and harvest index were important traits related to grain yield. Therefore, the main reason for the difference in grain yield of the lines can be attributed to the difference in these traits and can be used in barley breeding programs to select cultivars and high-yielding lines.

#### **ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE**

Not applicable.

#### **HUMAN AND ANIMAL RIGHTS**

No Animals/Humans were used for studies that are based on this research.

#### **CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION**

Not applicable.

#### **AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS**

The author confirms that the data supporting the findings of this research are available within the article.

#### **FUNDING**

None.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The authors thank the Department of Plant Breeding and biotechnology of Sari Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources University and the Department of Seed and Plant Improvement Research of Yazd Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center for supporting this study.

#### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors have no conflict of interest.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Abarnak S, Zarei L, Cheghamirza K. Evaluation of some important agronomic and physiological traits in barley cultivars in rain fed conditions. *Crop Physiology Journal*. 2018; 9(36):41-63 (In Persian with English Summary).
2. Abdulla A. Managerial use of factor analysis for identifying stability of yield parameters and morphological characters in barley trials. *International Journal of Management and Applied Research*. 2018; 5(2):69-81.

3. Afzalifar A, Zahravi M, Bihamta MR. Evaluation of tolerant genotypes to drought stress in Karaj region. *Iranian Journal of Agronomy and Plant Breeding*. 2011; 7(1):25-44 (In Persian with English Summary).
4. Ahmadi A, Hosseinpour T. Investigation the effect of plant density on the growth process of barley (*Hordeum Vulgare* L.) genotypes under rain fed conditions. *Crop Physiology Journal*. 2013; 5(17):89-102 (In Persian with English Summary).
5. Ahmadi A, Pourghasemi R, Hosseinpour T. Relationship between grain yield and yield components of barley genotypes by multivariate statistical methods. *Agroecology Journal*. 2014; 10(3):1-13 (In Persian with English Summary).
6. Ataei M. Path analysis of barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) yield. *Ankara Universitesi Ziraat Fakultesi Tarim Bilimleri Dergisi*. 2006; 12(3):227-232.
7. Bates LS, Waldren RP, Teare ID. Rapid determination of free proline for water stress studies. *Plant and Soil*. 1973; 39:205-207.
8. Dadashi MR, Noorinia A, Askar M, Azizi Sh. Evaluation of correlation between physiological and morphological traits with yield in hull-less barley lines. *Journal of Crop Ecophysiology*. 2010; 4(15):29-40 (In Persian with English Summary).
9. Del Blanco IA, Rajaram S, Kronstad WE. Agronomic potential of synthetic hexaploid wheat-derived populations. *Crop Science*. 2001; 3(41):670-676.
10. Fitter AH, Hay RKM. *Environmental physiology of plants*. 2nd ed. Academic Press, London. 1987; pp. 227-228.
11. Flowers TJ, Flowers SA. Why does salinity pose such a difficult problem for plant breeders?. *Agricultural Water Management*. 2005; 78:15-24.
12. Guertin WH, Bailey JP. *Introduction to modern factor analysis*. Edwards Brothers Inc., Michigan. 1982; pp. 405.
13. Hosein Babaei A, Aharizad S, Mohammadi SA, Yarnia M, Norouzi M. Identification of effective traits on barley lines grain yield via path analysis. *Journal of Crop Breeding*. 2013; 5(11):49-59 (In Persian with English Summary).
14. Hosseinpour T. Relationship among agronomic characteristics and grain yield in hull-less barley genotypes under rainfed conditions of Koohdasht. *Iranian journal of crop sciences*. 2012; 14(3):263-279 (In Persian with English Summary).
15. Jabbari M, Zolfaghary F. Evaluate of yield and traits in relation to seed yield in barley lines under drought stress and non-stress condition using factor analysis. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Sustainable Production*. 2014; 23(4.1):29-39 (In Persian with English Summary).
16. Jackson JE. *A user's guide to principal components*. Wiley Inter Science, New York, USA. 1991; pp. 592.
17. Khajavi A, Aharizad S, Ahmadizadeh M. Genetic diversity of promising lines of barley based

on pheno-morphological traits in Ardabil area. International Journal of Advanced Biological and Biomedical Research, 2014; 2(2):456-462.

18. Khalili M, Mohammadian R. Identifying QTLs associated with salinity tolerance in early stages of barley germination”, Journal of Crop Biotechnology. 2016; 5(13):41-55 (In Persian with English Summary).
19. Kilian B, Ozkan H, Pozzi C, Salamini F. Domestication of the Triticeae in the Fertile Crescent. Genetics and Genomics of the Triticeae, New York. 2009; pp. 81-119.
20. Moslemi H, Solouki M, Fakheri BA. Evaluation of morphology traits of barley double haploid lines under hydroponic conditions. Journal of Crop Breeding. 2016; 8(18):144-152 (In Persian with English Summary).
21. Muller G. Determining leaf water surface area by means of linear measurement in wheat and triticale. Novernytermules. 1991; 40:141-152.
22. Nasri R, Paknejad F, Sadeghi shoa M, Ghorbani S, Fatemi Z. Correlation and path analysis of drought stress on yield and yield components of barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) in Karaj region”, Iranian Journal of Agronomy and Plant Breeding. 2013; 8(4):155-165 (In Persian with English Summary).
23. Poehlman JM, Sleper DA. Breeding field crops”, 4th ed. Iowa State University Press. Ames Iowa, USA. 1995; pp. 494.
24. Rharrabti Y, Elhani S, Martos Nunes V, Garcia Del Moral L.F. Relationship between some quality traits and yield of durum wheat under southern Spain conditions. CIHEAM-Option Mediterraneans. 1998; 40(1):529-531.
25. Saroei E, Cheghamirza K, Zarei L. Genetic diversity of characteristics in barley cultivars. Genetika. 2017; 49(2):495-510.
26. Seyed Aghamiri SMM, Mostafavi Kh, Mohammadi A. Investigation of the relationship between grain yield and yield components in barley varieties and new hybrids using multivariate statistical methods. Iranian journal of field crops research. 2012; 10(2):421-427 (In Persian with English Summary).
27. Zaare M, Jafari H. Quantitative trait loci diversity for salt tolerance at the early growth stage of barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.). Crop Breeding Journal. 2013; 3(2):69-77.
28. Zaefizadeh M, Ghasemi M, Azimi J, Khayatnezhad M, Ahadzadeh B. Correlation Analysis and Path Analysis for Yield and its Components in Hullless Barley. Advances in Environmental Biology. 2011; 5(1):123-126.